arXiv:1608.01605v1 [quant-ph] 4 Aug 2016

Reply to the Comment on "The Lifshitz-Matsubara sum formula for the Casimir pressure between magnetic metallic mirrors"

R. Guérout,[1] A. Lambrecht,[1] K. A. Milton,[2] and S. Reynaud[1]

[1] *Laboratoire Kastler Brossel, UPMC-Sorbonne Universités, CNRS, ENS-PSL Research University, Collège de France, F-75252 Paris, France**

[2] *H. L. Dodge Dept. of Physics and Astronomy, Univ. of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019 USA*

(Dated: August 5, 2016)

Abstract

We reply to the "Comment on 'The Lifshitz-Matsubara sum formula for the Casimir pressure between magnetic metallic mirrors'". We believe the comment misrepresents our papers, and fails to provide a plausible resolution to the conflict between theory and experiment.

In our recent publication [1], we have extended the analysis presented in [2] for non magnetic materials in order to include the case of magnetic materials. The Comment [3] on the paper [1] does not discuss this extension to the magnetic case. It deals with points related to the context in which our paper [2] was written but misses completely the original results obtained in [2] as well as [1]. It also contains descriptions of the content of [1, 2] which clearly contradicts what is written in these papers.

The authors of [3] claim that we advocated a redefinition of the plasma susceptibility. In contrast to this claim, we were extremely careful to avoid confusion between different definitions of the susceptibility. To this purpose, we introduced specific notations in order to distinguish the 3 different definitions

- $\chi_\gamma = \epsilon_\gamma - 1 = \frac{\sigma_\gamma}{-i\omega}$ with $\sigma_\gamma = \frac{\omega_p^2}{\gamma - i\omega}$ for the Drude model ;
- χ_η for the limit of the Drude model when $\gamma \to 0$
- χ_0 for the lossless plasma model where $\gamma = 0$.

We clearly stated in [1, 2] that the Drude model matches at low frequencies the optical (permittivity ϵ_γ) and electrical (conductivity σ_γ) characteristic functions of the metallic plates used in the experiment when γ has

* guerout@lkb.upmc.fr

the appropriate value for the metal of interest (say for example gold or nickel). In contrast, the models χ_0 as well as χ_η do not match these optical and electrical properties [4, 5]. We introduced the words "Casimir puzzle" to emphasize the undisputed fact that experimental measurements [6, 7] are in better agreement with the plasma model χ_0 than with the Drude model χ_γ whereas the latter is a much better motivated description of the actual properties of the plates.

The main content of our papers [1, 2] consists in careful derivations of the Lifshitz formulas for the Casimir force when these different definitions are used. In particular, we devoted a special attention to give a proper description of the difference between χ_η and χ_0, in the sense of distribution theory. We did then show that this difference is a source of delicate problems in the usual derivation of the Casimir pressure, and that the commonly used Lifshitz-Matsubara sum formula has to be corrected when using the susceptibility χ_η. This is the main technical result in our papers. The Comment [3] gives an unfair representation of their content by claiming that we confuse the 2 definitions χ_η and χ_0 and then ignoring the new results obtained through a careful study of their difference.

Our papers are interesting from a pure theoretical point of view, as they shed new light on the subtleties of the application of Cauchy's residue theorem in the context of the calculation of the Casimir forces. In contrast the Comment contains confusing discussions of analytical properties of response functions, based on textbook material (ref. [10] in [3]) which is not sufficient for a correct analysis of the debated points. Equation (4) in [3] is not a sensible relation in the theory of distributions, and its loose manipulation leads to the difficulties discussed in the Comment. In contrast, our definition of χ_η (eq. (8) in [1]) or its representation in terms of the distribution δ' (eq. (9) in [1] fully equivalent to eq. (8)) allows one to derive the correct formula for the Casimir force [2].

The last part of the Comment is an awkward justification of the use of the ill-motivated plasma model when comparing experimental results to theoretical predictions. The susceptibility function (6) in [3] does not match the well-known optical and electrical properties of metallic plates, and the agreement of the predictions drawn from this model with experiments can only be considered as a puzzle yet to be solved. The proposition in [3] according to which metals would not respond to quantum fluctuations of fields as they do for classical fields is weird as it invalidates the theory used to obtain predictions. The very idea of comparing theory and experiment loses any meaning if one feels free to change at will the theory so that its pre-

dictions agree with the measurements.

[1] R. Guérout, A. Lambrecht, K. A. Milton and S. Reynaud *Phys. Rev. E* **93**, 022108 (2016)

[2] R. Guérout, A. Lambrecht, K. A. Milton and S. Reynaud *Phys. Rev. E* **90**, 042125 (2014)

[3] G.L. Klimchitskaya and V.M. Mostepanenko, Comment on "The Lifshitz-Matsubara sum formula for the Casimir pressure between magnetic metallic mirrors" to appear in Phys. Rev E (2016).

[4] A. Lambrecht and S. Reynaud, *Euro. Phys. J.* **D 8** 309 (2000).

[5] V.B. Svetovoy, P.J. van Zwol, G. Palasantzas and J.Th.M. De Hosson, *Phys. Rev. B* **77** 035439 (2008).

[6] R. S. Decca, D. López, E. Fischbach *et al*, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 077101 (2007)

[7] C.-C. Chang, A. A. Banishev, R. Castillo-Garza *et al*, *Phys. Rev. B* **85** 165443 (2012).